

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

B7



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,833	04/19/2001	Ojas T. Choksi	062891.0514	2045

7590 09/08/2004  
Terry J. Stalford  
Baker Botts, L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
----------

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2683	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,833

Applicant(s)

CHOKSI, OJAS T.

Examiner

Sharad K. Rampuria

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 37-39 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 37-39 are allowed as in previous action.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 13-16, 19, 21, 25-28, 31, & 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholefield et al. in view of Basu et al.

1. Regarding Claim 1, Scholefield disclosed A method for managing real-time bandwidth requests in a wireless network (abstract), comprising:

Art Unit: 2683

receiving a bandwidth request for a connection to a cell of a wireless network; the received request comprising a call admission request, an additional bandwidth request, or a handoff request. (col.3; 9-19)

Scholefield fails to disclosed determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that the received request including subscription level information; determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information; and processing the received request for the connection based on the priority. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.

2. Regarding Claim 2, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the priority comprises a subscription level. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 1, wherein the priority comprises a subscription level. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the priority comprises a subscription level in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.

3. Regarding Claim 3, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 1, wherein the subscription level comprises a quality of service (QoS) and processing the request based on the QoS comprises processing the request in an order based on the QoS. (Col.5; 14-39)

Art Unit: 2683

7. Regarding Claim 7, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 1, wherein the request is a call origination request. (col.3; 9-14)

9. Regarding Claim 9, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 1, wherein the connection is an existing connection and the request is an additional bandwidth request for the connection. (col.4; 33-39)

13. Regarding Claim 13, Scholefield disclosed A system for managing real-time bandwidth requests in a wireless network (abstract), comprising:  
means for receiving a request for a connection for bandwidth of a cell of a wireless network;  
(col.3; 9-19)

Scholefield fails to disclosed determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that the received request including subscription level information; determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information; and processing the received request for the connection based on the priority. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.

Art Unit: 2683

14. Regarding Claim 14, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the priority comprises a subscription level. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 13, wherein the priority comprises a subscription level. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the priority comprises a subscription level in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.

15. Regarding Claim 15, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 13, wherein the subscription level comprises a quality of service (QoS) and processing the request based on the QoS comprises processing the request in an order based on the QoS. (Col.5; 14-39)

16. Regarding Claim 16, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 15, means for processing the request in the order based on the QoS comprising:

means for retrieving a QoS policy for the connection; means for determining a class of service (CoS) for the connection based on the QoS policy; means for queuing the request in a corresponding CoS queue; and means for processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.

Art Unit: 2683

19. Regarding Claim 19, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 13, wherein the request is a call origination request. (col.3; 9-14)

21. Regarding Claim 21, Scholefield disclosed The system of Claim 13, wherein the connection is an existing connection and the request is an additional bandwidth request for the connection. (col.4; 33-39)

25. Regarding Claim 25, Scholefield disclosed A system for managing real-time bandwidth request in a wireless network, comprising: logic encoded in media (abstract), comprising: the logic operable to receive a request for a connection for bandwidth of a cell of a wireless network; (col.3; 9-19)

Scholefield fails to disclosed determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that the received request including subscription level information; determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information; and processing the received request for the connection based on the priority. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include determining a priority associated with the connection based on the subscription level information in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.



Art Unit: 2683

26. Regarding Claim 26, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the priority comprises a subscription level. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 25, wherein the priority comprises a subscription level. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the priority comprises a subscription level in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.

27. Regarding Claim 27, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 25, wherein the subscription level comprises a quality of service (QoS) and processing the request based on the QoS comprises processing the request in an order based on the QoS. (Col.5; 14-39)

28. Regarding Claim 28, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 25, the logic operable to process the request in the order based on the QoS by retrieving a QoS policy for the connection; determining a class of service (CoS) for the connection based on the QoS policy; queuing the request in a corresponding CoS queue; and processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed. (Col.3; 38-55 & Col.6; 36-52) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the subscription level comprises a quality of service (QoS) in order to provide the bandwidth allocation based on grade of service.

Art Unit: 2683

31. Regarding Claim 31, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 25, wherein the request is a call origination request. (col.3; 9-14)

33. Regarding Claim 33, Scholefield disclosed The method of Claim 25, wherein the connection is an existing connection and the request is an additional bandwidth request for the connection. (col.4; 33-39)

Claims 4-6, 17-18 & 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholefield et al. & Basu et al. further in view of Olkkonen et al.

4. Regarding Claim 4, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except determining a class of service (CoS) for the connection based on the QoS policy. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 3, processing the request in the order based on the QoS comprising:

retrieving a QoS policy for the connection; (col.4; 59-67)

determining a class of service (CoS) for the connection based on the QoS policy; (col.4; 59-67)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include determining a class of service (CoS) for the connection based on the QoS policy in order to provide quantitative QoS parameters in a wireless network.

The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except queuing the request in a corresponding CoS queue. However, Olkkonen teaches in an analogous art, that queuing the request in a corresponding CoS queue and processing the request after requests in

Art Unit: 2683

higher priority CoS queues have been processed. (FIFO queue; col.4; 40-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include queuing the request in a corresponding CoS queue in order to provide packet prioritization when routing the data packets.

5. Regarding Claim 5, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached. However, Olkkonen teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 4, further comprising clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached. (col.4; 40-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached in order to provide the propagation delay threshold in a wireless network.

6. Regarding Claim 6, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 1, wherein the subscription level comprises a class of service (CoS), further comprising:

receiving a plurality of requests each for admission of a connection to the cell of the wireless network; (col.4; 59-67)

queuing each of the requests in one of a plurality of queues corresponding to the CoS for the connection; (col.6; 19-35)

Art Unit: 2683

processing requests in the queues by queue beginning with a queue corresponding to a highest priority CoS and in a descending order of CoS priority to provide bandwidth to corresponding connections until available bandwidth is exhausted. (col.6; 19-35) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed in order to provide quantitative QOS parameters in a wireless network.

The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold. However, Olkkonen teaches in an analogous art, that clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold. (col.4; 40-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold in order to provide the propagation delay threshold in a wireless network.

17. Regarding Claim 17, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached. However, Olkkonen teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 16, further comprising means for clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached. (col.4; 40-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached in order to provide the propagation delay threshold in a wireless network.

Art Unit: 2683

18. Regarding Claim 18, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 13, wherein the subscription level comprises a class of service (CoS), further comprising:

means for receiving a plurality of requests each for admission of a connection to the cell of the wireless network; (col.4; 59-67)

means for queuing each of the requests in one of a plurality of queues corresponding to the CoS for the connection; (col.6; 19-35)

means for processing requests in the queues by queue beginning with a queue corresponding to a highest priority CoS and in a descending order of CoS priority to provide bandwidth to corresponding connections until available bandwidth is exhausted. (col.6; 19-35) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed in order to provide quantitative QOS parameters in a wireless network.

The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold. However, Olkkonen teaches in an analogous art, that clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold. (col.4; 40-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold in order to provide the propagation delay threshold in a wireless network.

29. Regarding Claim 29, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached. However, Olkkonen teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 28, the logic further operable to clear the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached. (col.4; 40-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include clearing the request after a delay threshold for the request is reached in order to provide the propagation delay threshold in a wireless network.

30. Regarding Claim 30, Scholefield disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed. However, Basu teaches in an analogous art, that The system of Claim 25, wherein the subscription level comprises a class of service (CoS), the logic further operable to receive a plurality of requests each for admission of a connection to the cell of the wireless network, (col.4; 59-67) queue each of the requests in one of a plurality of queues corresponding to the CoS for the connection (col.6; 19-35), highest priority CoS and in a descending order of CoS priority to provide bandwidth to corresponding connections until available bandwidth is exhausted. (col.6; 19-35) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request after requests in higher priority CoS queues have been processed in order to provide quantitative QOS parameters in a wireless network.

The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold. However, Olkkonen teaches in an analogous art, that clear from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold and process requests in the

Art Unit: 2683

queues. (col.4; 40-60) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include clearing from the queues any request reaching a delay threshold in order to provide the propagation delay threshold in a wireless network.

Claims 8, 10-12, 20, 22-24, 32 & 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholefield et al. & Basu et al. further in view of Nagarajan et al.

8. Regarding Claim 8, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the request is a handoff request. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 1, wherein the request is a handoff request. (col.5; 45-51) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the request is a handoff request in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

10. Regarding Claim 10, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 1, further comprising processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell. (col.6; 11-26) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

Art Unit: 2683

11. Regarding Claim 11, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 10, wherein the cell comprises a plurality of blocking thresholds and further comprising processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold. (col.6; 45-63) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

12. Regarding Claim 12, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 11, wherein the cell comprises a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests. (col.6; 45-63) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests in order to provide admitting new and/or handoff calls into a wireless network.

20. Regarding Claim 20, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the request is a handoff request. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The



Art Unit: 2683

system of Claim 13, wherein the request is a handoff request. (col.5; 45-51) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the request is a handoff request in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

22. Regarding Claim 22, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 13, further comprising processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell. (col.6; 11-26) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

23. Regarding Claim 23, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 22, wherein the cell comprises a plurality of blocking thresholds and further comprising processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold. (col.6; 45-63) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

24. Regarding Claim 24, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 23, wherein the cell comprises a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests. (col.6; 45-63) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests in order to provide admitting new and/or handoff calls into a wireless network.

32. Regarding Claim 32, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the request is a handoff request. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 25, wherein the request is a handoff request. (col.5; 45-51) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the request is a handoff request in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

34. Regarding Claim 34, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 25, the logic further comprising processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell. (col.6; 11-26) Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2683

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a blocking threshold for the cell in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

35. Regarding Claim 35, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 25, wherein the cell comprises a plurality of blocking thresholds and further comprising processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold. (col.6; 45-63) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include processing the request by determining whether allowing the request would exceed a corresponding blocking threshold in order to provide admitting handoff calls into a wireless network.

36. Regarding Claim 36, The above combination disclosed all the particulars of the claim except a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests. However, Nagarajan teaches in an analogous art, that The method of Claim 25, wherein the cell comprises a call bandwidth blocking threshold for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests. (col.6; 45-63) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a call bandwidth blocking threshold

Art Unit: 2683

for call admission and additional bandwidth requests and a handoff blocking threshold for call handoff requests in order to provide admitting new and/or handoff calls into a wireless network.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 37-39 are allowed based on "the first and second connections each have their own QOS, COS levels and the handoff request/Admission policy."


Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-308-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Sharad Rampuria  
August 27, 2004

  
WILLIAM TROST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600